Tells the Facts and Names the Names

CounterPunch

MAY 1-15, 1998 *Ken Silverstein & Alexander Cockburn* **VOL. 5, NO. 9**

■ IN THIS ISSUE

THE NEW ACADEMIC UNDERCLASS

- "Higher Education": Bureaucratic Bloat and Campus Helots
- The Untenured Slaves Who Do the Work
- The Pot-Belly Pigs Who Rule the Sty

BIG BAD BANKS

- Why Barney Frank Loves the IMF
- Why Dick Armey Hates It

MISSION FOR MADELEINE

- Saving the Taku

OUR LITTLE SECRET

- Jesse Jackson: Q. How Bad Can He Be? (A. Incredibly Bad)
- Lani on Bill

Back to the Middle Ages

The Rise of the Lumpen Teacher

Across the entire landscape of higher education in America today a vast shift has been taking place in the past few years that in many ways matches the onslaught on the economic security and working conditions of blue collar workers since the early 1970s. Visit any two or four-year institution of higher education and one finds the same basic pattern: a swelling army of low-paid, overworked junior academics, picking up piece-work assignments with near zero economic security; a shrinking sector of senior tenured academics; and a swelling academic bureaucracy over which preside the pashas of the system, the university presidents and senior administrators pulling down enormous salaries and reveling in princely quarters and lavish benefits.

For a literary image of what higher education today resembles, Chaucer's Canterbury Tales is a useful guide. At the bottom are the humble clerks, medieval equivalent of untenured junior faculty, teaching assistants and the lumpenised reserve army of the semi-unemployed that services higher education in America today. From these clerks hobbling along in their rags we move to the rich priors and monastic bureaucrats, ever upward to the plump bursars and swag-bellied abbots heading the cavalcade.

Half of the teaching load in higher education is currently carried by contingent instructors. The American Association of University Professors found recently that it's common for departments of modern languages, English, and Math to have part-time instructors handling 65 percent or more of the teaching load.

In the Sociology Department at Michigan State University, contingent instructors taught 50 per cent of the fall 1997 roster of undergraduate courses. Taken a step further, if we exclude senior level courses (which are rarely taught by contingent instructors, as they usually correspond to the research and professional interests of tenured faculty, and are frequently the only classes they will teach), the percentage of non-senior level courses taught by contingent instructors rises to an amazing 75 per cent. Virtually all freshman and sophomore classes are being taught by lumpen academics. These trends are visible across the country. When describing their situation, these "road scholars" invariably tell of bleak working conditions with little promise of promotion or stable employment.

This transformation of academic labor raises serious political economic questions about the power relations driving the process, yet these structural issues are rarely addressed, even in the narratives of the victims. Indeed, they tend to parrot administrative rhetoric about budget crises and the inevitability of restructuring on "efficient" corporate lines. They have to be "realistic", since departments can't afford tenured positions with all the economic pressures higher education is under. Thus they internalize the arguments of the administrators.

Downsizing has been a strategy for weakening union power and generating sublime levels of corporate profit. In the academic world the downgrading of instructors and bureaucratic bloat are the forms this process have taken. Recent graduates with Ph.D's can't find jobs. The tenured faculty ranks are shriveled. Academic temp workers hustle from gig to gig, while managerial levels continue to grow, flush with the funds plundered from instruction budgets.

To be sure, higher education has suf-

(**Lumpen Teachers**, *continued on page 6)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Little Secret

The Scoundrelly Rev

These days Jesse Jackson is noising it abroad that he may be contemplating another run at the Democratic nomination. To this end the Rev has been trotting around in Appalachia, projecting concern for the underdog. In recent months we at CounterPunch have come to the conclusion, based on scrutiny of several extremely unappetizing sagas, that the Rev is a scoundrel, a huckster, a deceiver of the poor, an apologist for some of the most brutal corporate forces in America and some of the most bloodstained regimes in the Third World. Some may say, with reasonable justification, that such characteristics make the Rev an entirely appropriate Democratic contender. This proposition notwithstanding, we are delighted to provide useful material on the once and maybe future candidate.

As we detailed in our last issue, Jackson has been operating a cover-up campaign for General Motors, trying to undercut the efforts of GM's minority dealers to get justice from America's largest company. So much for his service to business at home.

Editors
Ken Silverstein
Alexander Cockburn

Co-writers
Raymond Garcia
Jeffrey St. Clair

Design
Deborah Thomas

Counselor
Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions,
$25 student/low-income
CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch welcomes all tips, information and suggestions.
CounterPunch
P.O. Box 18675
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-986-3665 (phone)
202-986-0974 (fax)

As for Jackson's relations with bloodthirsty regimes abroad, Our Little Secret takes note that Jackson has recently popped up on the national radar screen meeting with Phil Carroll, the head of Shell Oil, lauding him as "an enlightened leader." Readers of CounterPunch no doubt remember Carroll not so much for his enlightenment as for his position as a boss of a company that colluded with the military regime in Nigeria (which pulls in more than $50 million a day from the oil companies) to hang Ken Saro-Wiwa and his companions who had been agitating against Shell Oil's destruction of the Ogoni homelands in the Niger River Delta. As part of Shell's contract with the Nigerian junta, it is required to pay the salaries and expenses of Nigerian security forces in the region. Shell went beyond the terms of its deal to donate arms and ammunition to the "Kill-and-Go Teams" that have crushed Ogoni environmental protests.

"There seemed to be an implication," Duhaney wrote to Jesse Jackson, "that if a person was not donating sufficient money to you then you would abandon that person's cause."

Jackson has his own ties to Nigeria's ruling group of murderers. He enjoys a warm personal relationship with General Ibrahim Babangida. It was Babangida who orchestrated the coup that toppled the democratically-elected government of Moshood Abiola and paved the way to power for Gen. Sani Abacha in 1993. "Abacha is an equal opportunity killer," Michael Fleshman of the Africa Fund tells us. "He kills people of all ethnic groups and religions. Anyone who objects to his rule is at risk."

Jackson has always capitalized on his usefulness to the US government and corporate America as "unofficial ambassador" to Africa. He leaped to back the Clinton gang's Nigerian "policy", though this word is a shade too dignified given the naked opportunism involved. The "policy"? Do nothing to interfere with the swift extraction of oil—notably the valuable Bonney Light—from Nigeria and its shipment to the United States on favorable terms. Of the oil taken out of Nigeria, 48 per cent belongs to Shell, 23 per cent to Mobil, 22 per cent to Chevron. The rest is divided between Texaco and the French firm, ELF-Aquitane. To assist in this enterprise the US government has embarked on what it terms "constructive engagement" with the Nigerian junta, exactly the same phrase used by the Reaganites back in the early 1980s to describe their policy towards the apartheid government of South Africa. In this enterprise, Jesse Jackson is a hundred per cent on board.

Real Americans

Now for yet another malodorous performance from Jackson, in the matter of the GM dealers. We give you the case of Trevor Duhaney, Jamaican-born and south Florida's only black GM dealer, which tells us a lot about both the sunshine state and the company.

Duhaney's business was in trouble for the same reasons that beleaguered most of the other operators of black dealerships in GM cars. The company stinted on credit, gave its black dealers terrible locations and provided minimal support. In April of 1997 Duhaney and several other minority dealers took their troubles to Jesse Jackson. The Rev pumped them up with inspirational verbiage, to the effect that God was on their side and they should fight with every sinew and ounce of will.

Duhaney digested this message and acted on it. He became a fierce critic of GM, thus exposing himself as a target. On November 17 of last year, after stories by Demetrius Patterson and CounterPunch had explored the scandal of GM's behavior to its minority dealers, Duhaney received a visit from Charles Harrell, a friend of Jackson's who serves as president of the National Association of Minority Auto Dealers.

Harrell came directly to the point and told Duhaney he had but one choice: give back his dealership to GM. Harrell said that Duhaney had fallen out of favor with GM management and (as Duhaney recalled his words) said "once a white man did not like you, there would be no options other than what the white man would make available".

Irked at this visit, Duhaney wrote to Jackson asking why it was that Harrell claimed he was relaying this message on behalf of the Rev. "There seemed to be an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

implication," Duhaney wrote to Jackson, "that if a person was not donating sufficient money to you then you would abandon that person's cause." Duhaney added in his letter that Harrell had told him that the civil rights leader and Operation Rainbow/PUSH would otherwise be "too busy to work on this matter".

When Harrell was confronted with Duhaney's charges by a reporter from the Broward Daily Business Review he lashed out at Duhaney, saying "Maybe Jamaicans are different." The Rainbow emissary continued, "He's not a real American."

Lani Looks Back

We've been reading Lani Guinier's absorbing memoir, *Lift Every Voice*, particularly her account of how Bill Clinton threw her over the side after nominating her as head of the civil rights division of the Justice Department. When Guinier discovered that her nomination was languishing in the Senate, she called on the supreme fixer, Vernon Jordan, for help in getting her an intro to Senator Alan Simpson. The man who spent many an assiduous hour on job searches for Monica Lewinsky brushed off Guinier's request, saying "I don't do that kind of thing".

Guinier has no respect for Clinton in the area of race initiatives, pointing out that in no less than twenty trips to California in 1996, the chairman of innumerable town meetings on race had not been able to bring himself to utter the difficult phrase "affirmative action". On the ballot in California that year was the hottest issue in the state, the anti-affirmative action initiative that eventually romped home.

In talking up her book on Chris Matthews's MSNBC show "Hardball", Guinier recounted a joke that Clinton told to a group of southern Democrats on the subject of affirmative action. "If we hadn't lost the civil war, we wouldn't have had to deal with this crap." So much for the great healer.

Prize Spectacle

One of the more surreal moments last year, and frankly, we're still not sure whether we dreamed it, was news that Henry Kissinger was giving a prize to Rupert Murdoch, in a handclasp as chilling as in any recent history of public embraces. But we were certainly wide awake this year, on April 26 to be precise, when we saw Henry the K present US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright with the "Seeds of Peace Award". This bizarre spectacle took place at a $750-a-plate dinner in New York at the Plaza. Albright, be it recalled, once told Leslie Stahl of CBS that the starving to death of 600,000 Iraqis under the US-led embargo was "a price we think worth paying".

Dinner With Dan

Last year, one of CounterPunch's editors infiltrated a number of Congressional fund-raisers in the course of researching an article on campaign finance reform. The article was subsequently published, annoying both Democrats and Republicans.

So it came as a major though pleasant surprise when this same editor recently received a letter from Sen. Mitch McConnell, chairman of the National Republican Senate Committee, offering him a coveted slot on the GOP Presidential Roundtable. That's a group headed by Sen. Rick Santorum of Pennsylvania and whose honorary chairman is former vice president Dan Quayle.

"It is a basic principle of business, that those who work the hardest receive the greatest rewards," McConnell's ingratiating epistle commenced. "It's the way we identify our nation's leaders. That is why I am pleased to inform you that in recognition of your personal achievements, I have nominated you to serve as one of the District of Columbia's representatives" on the Roundtable.

McConnell went on to explain that the Roundtable is a "unique group of only 400 Americans...made up of men and women, just like you, who have a tremendous faith in America's future and have crucial expertise and experience to share with our Republican leaders." Membership offers privileges such as invitations to special invitation-only Party events, including national Republican conventions and GOP Presidential Inaugurals, as well as "constant interaction with our 55 Republican Senators who truly appreciate your advice, counsel and support". Not to mention a "distinctive lapel pin specially authorized by the National Republican Senatorial Committee".

Membership in the Roundtable also reserves a seat - at an extra price - at the GOP's National Policy Forum, which was held March 29-31 at the J.W. Marriott Hotel in downtown Washington. Every big name Republican was on hand, including Dick Armey, Grover Norquist, Newt Gingrich and Senator John Ashcroft. The highlight of the whole affair was undoubtedly the first night's after-dinner show, which featured Wayne Newton.

CounterPunch was all set to attend when we noticed that hard work alone does not win one a seat at the Roundtable. That costs $5,000 per year, plus another $275 to attend the Policy Forum.

Smoke and Mirrors

Few people are likely to have been more shaken by Big Tobacco's walkout on the proposed settlement with the government than Bill Novelli of the Center for Tobacco Free Kids. Some CounterPunch readers may be familiar with the group, which has been running maudlin full-page newspaper ads that attack the tobacco barons for getting youngsters hooked on cigarettes.

The settlement talks between Congress and tobacco companies were halted in early April because industry wanted full legal protection against future lawsuits from sick smokers in exchange for payments of $368 billion. Congress balked at that provision, which is fiercely opposed by most anti-tobacco groups.

Why would Novelli be upset about the tobacco companies pulling out of the settlement talks? Any deal would have required the tobacco companies to set aside huge amounts of money for anti-smoking ads, and a big chunk of that money was to go to public relations firms to produce the TV and radio ads for such campaigns.

Before becoming head of the Center for Tobacco Free Kids, Novelli was a partner in the beltway PR shop of Porter-Novelli. His old firm - which still goes by the same name, though Novelli is supposedly no longer connected to it - would have reaped millions to produce those counter-smoking ads if the deal had gone down. Indeed, Porter-Novelli already has received large sums of cigarette money from a $70 million pot delivered from the tobacco industry to the state of Florida, when the two sides struck their own deal last year.

Maybe that's why Novelli pushed so hard for a settlement and was one of the few "public interest" advocates who argued in favor of giving tobacco the full legal protection it desired.

By the way, the proposed $368 billion settlement figure isn't nearly as burdensome to big tobacco as it might appear. The money was to be paid over a period of 25 years, would have been tax deductible and would have been easy to pass on to customers in the form of higher prices. ■

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The World Upside Down
Who Really Loves Big Banks?

Is there any scientific way of distinguishing a Congressional "liberal" from a Congressional "right-winger"? In the March 16 issue of CounterPunch, we told how a group of liberal members of Congress and think tank denizens have been leading the charge to win an $18 billion "replenishment" for the International Monetary Fund, a SWAT team working across the globe to look after the interests of First World banks and international capital. Meanwhile, conservatives such as George Schultz, secretary of state under Ronald Reagan, is a leader of the "Death to the IMF" forces.

Since then, the situation has grown ever more bizarre. While the Democrats have collapsed entirely, many in the GOP, including most of the party leadership, are threatening to block or delay any bill that includes IMF bail-out money. House Speaker Newt Gingrich says the Republicans won't be scared into approving money by the doomsday scenarios of impending global crisis being spread about by the Clinton administration. He has gone so far as to argue that employees of the Fund — whose standard policy prescriptions include higher taxes and reduced subsidies - should themselves have to pay taxes on their bloated salaries, from which they are now exempt. "If they think tax increases are so good, how come no staff member of the IMF pays taxes anywhere in the world?" Gingrich said on April 27.

To help readers sort through the politics of the IMF, we offer the following quiz. On April 23, the House debated the Clinton administration's proposed $18 billion bailout of the IMF. Match up the following statements with the person who made it. No cheating!

A. House Minority Leader Dick Gephardt, often regarded as the standard bearer of labor in Congress.

B. Rep. Dana Rohrabacher, right-wing Republican from California.

C. Rep. Barney Frank, hero of the Democratic liberal crowd in Massachusetts.

D. House Majority Leader Dick Armey, Republican Neanderthal from Texas.

E. House Speaker Newt Gingrich, monster from the Dark Lagoon.

F. Rep. David Bonior, quintessential liberal Democrat from the upper Midwest.

1. "I voted for Fast Track when George Bush was President. I voted for the WTO. I stand ready to vote for Fast Track for President Clinton...I was ready to vote for a NAFTA that had sufficient teeth in the side agreements...I now believe we cannot really have capitalism unless we ultimately have democracy and human rights. But we also know we cannot get those things to be achieved overnight, and so we have got to have a little bit of humility about what we know will work and what can bring these countries back to economic health."

2. "Two major US banks reported yesterday that they had had record profits. None of the big banks are suffering out of Indonesia. They have made their money. They are not suffering out of South Korea. But what does the International Monetary Fund answer? Raise taxes on the working poor."

The crafty linking of Kim Dae-Chung with the IMF, to the enhancement of the latter, comes from Barney Frank.

3. "This is the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. We are being asked by this agency [the IMF], that operates in secrecy, 'Give us the money, or more catastrophe will come.' Many fine scholars believe that the catastrophe we have called the Asian flu was, in fact, created by the IMF."

4. "And what do they do with this money, this $18 billion and the other money going over to Asia? It is used to finance factories that put out goods and services that put our own people out of work."

5. "I happen to think that Kim Dae-Chung, the President of South Korea is one of the great, small d, democratic heroes of our era. I will guarantee to my colleagues that, if asked, he would express his appreciation for the role of the IMF."

6. "I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the motion to recommit [to the IMF], so we can begin the process of changing how we do business in the world."

And the envelope, please. Quote number one comes from that champion of labor, Dick Gephardt, who confesses that — with "a little bit of humility" — he's eager to bail out the IMF, an organization that's probably done more harm to workers around the globe than any other single organization in the world today.

And quote number two? By heavens, it's from the Monster himself, Newt Gingrich, who here correctly lambastes the IMF for its behavior. The third quote is from another wild man of the right, Dick Armey.

The fourth quote is from right-winger Rohrabacher, in words that could have been written by many a labor leader from the AFL-CIO (even though that outfit chickened out during the fight on IMF funding).

The crafty linking of Kim Dae-Chung with the IMF, to the enhancement of the latter, comes from Barney Frank. He should probably ask South Korea's president for his opinion of the massacre of Korean workers in the late-1970s, when Jimmy Carter was president. Back then, the banner of liberal opposition to CIA mayhem overseas was Senator Frank Church. One of his staffers was Karen Lissakers, who has now put away childish things and is executive director of the IMF. In late April, Lissakers confessed to a Congressional committee that she had paid no attention to Congressional stipulations that the IMF not provide bail-out money to human rights abusers.

And thus we come to quote six, in which Bonior elegantly manages the oldest of liberal tropisms, a fiery call for reform mingled with unwavering support for the status quo.

And the moral of the story? Gingrich and Armey both voiced support for the IMF bail-out early on and, at least in the case of Gingrich, may yet end up voting for the $18 billion replenishment.

Friends of CounterPunch tell us that the two GOP leaders are bashing the IMF as a way of currying favor with the far-right wing of the GOP, which hates big banks and the IMF. Gingrich sees IMF-bashing as a way to placate the ultras, many whom are discontented with his speakership. Armey is in the anti-IMF camp because Rep. Bob Livingston of Louisiana, his chief rival to succeed Gingrich as House Speaker, supports the

(**IMF**, *continued on page 5*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Saving the Taku River

At Last! Time For Albright To Do Something Useful

The last great wild river on the Pacific coast of North America is one most Americans have probably never heard of, a fact which in and of itself may explain its continued greatness. The human forces that have destroyed the Columbia, the Colorado and the Snake have not yet been brought to bear on the mighty Taku. This is a happy circumstance which may not last much longer, though the Clinton administration has it within its power to save the situation.

The Taku river rises in the mountains of British Columbia, arcs south-west through forested canyons into Southeast Alaska, where it crosses the Tongass National Forest before emptying into the Pacific just south of Juneau. It's the largest unroaded watershed on the west coast, covering some 4.5 million acres.

In terms of wildlife the Taku brings to mind Euclides da Cunha's famous description of the Amazon: "the last unwritten page of Genesis." Human impact has not decimated the original biota. There are wolves, mountain goats, caribou, moose and a wide range of birds from peregrine falcons to trumpeter swans. The Taku also harbors the healthiest population of grizzlies in the Northwest. In its waters flourish all five varieties of Pacific salmon, the chinook, the coho, the pink, the sockeye and the steelhead. At a time where salmon stocks up and down the west coast of the continent are in a state of collapse, the Taku runs remain abundant. There are no roads, no cows, no dams, no clearcuts, no mines.

The Taku watershed is not devoid of humans. Since 2000 BC the Taku River Tlingit have made their home along its banks, developing a culture that was described in admiring terms a century ago by Franz Boas, the founder of American anthropology. The Tlingit have never ceded their title to what they call the Taku River Valley.

This same place faces a doom from which US diplomacy may well be its only chance of rescue. A Vancouver-based mining company called Redfern Resources has been given preliminary approval by the provincial government of British Columbia to develop a vast lead, silver, zinc and gold mine in the heart of the Taku watershed. The mine is scheduled to produce 2,500 tons of ore a day, with a 99 mile-long road being carved from the landscape.

This same road would be overture to the destruction of the Taku. Its proposed route requires 69 crossings of salmon streams. It would offer access to logging trucks, to poachers and to other mines. Redfern Resources wants to set the bulldozers to work on the road this coming summer.

Furiously opposing such plans are the Taku Tlingit, who have written a spirited letter to the BC government, saying correctly, "Control over the land is control over us. For us the road is a drain on the spirit of the land."

The mine itself is a toxic disaster in the making. The wastes from the site would be highly acidic and loaded with heavy metals and other poisons. Redfern plans to build one of the tailings ponds within the flood plain of the Taku. Even the BC provincial government, long in the pocket of mining companies, admits that opening the mine, "could result in a chronic discharge of effluent contaminated with acids, heavy metals, petroleum products and/or toxic reagents."

Putting it somewhat more graphically, Bob Riley of the US Environmental Protection Agency recently told an Alaskan newspaper that "It's like a loaded gun." In his detailed review of Redfern's plans published this last March, conducted for the EPA, the Seattle-based Riley concludes that there is a high likelihood that the slurry from the mine will not settle in the tailings ponds but eventually leach into the Taku, poisoning the salmon-rich waters.

It's not often that one sees the governor of Alaska standing up for the environment or for any creature not equipped with a gun, a pickax, a sport utility vehicle or a chainsaw, but Tony Knowles has been vociferous in his denunciation of the mine.

The Canadians have thus far brushed off such complaints. But the Clinton administration has got a powerful weapon to hand, in the form of the Boundary Waters Act, signed by President Teddy Roosevelt in 1909. This grandfather of environmental side-agreements created a Joint International Commission, consisting of three Americans and three Canadians, to resolve disputes on trans-border waterways such as Taku.

Right now the US State Department has been asked by Governor Knowles, the Taku Tlingit (the only North American tribe to have dual citizenship), and several environmental groups including the Taku River League led by Ian Kean, to intervene under the terms of the 1909 law.

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has been talking lately of the great new project of US diplomacy, environmentalism. Now is her chance to demonstrate whether such language is anything more than hot air. ■

(**IMF**, *continued from page 4*)

bail-out. So Armey's attacks on international capital are a way to curry favor with the ultras, whom he alienated last year by refusing to support Rep. Bill Paxon's coup attempt against Gingrich.

Liberal Democrats, on the other hand, usually love big financial institutions like the IMF. The populist Wright Patman, who breathed fire on the banks in his years on the House Banking Committee, was finally toppled by liberal Democrats who installed the lackluster Henry Reuss of Wisconsin, who had exactly the same outlook as Bonior, in the shameful quote attached to his name. ■

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year individual, $40
One year institution, $100
One year student/low income, $25
Please send back issue(s) _____ ($3/issue)
"I am enclosing a separate sheet for gift subscriptions"

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

_____

Payment must accompany order.
Add $10 for foreign subscriptions.
Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch.**
Return to: **CounterPunch.**
PO Box 18675
Washington, DC 20036

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fered from economic crises, especially during the state fiscal crisis of the late 1970s and early 1980s. But after the lean years of the early 1980s, budgets for higher education have more than recovered through stable state appropriations, rocketing tuition revenues from heavily indebted students, and academic whoring for foundation and corporate grants. Over the 1990s, increases in state appropriations for higher education have held at the rate of inflation across the country, with the notable exception of California, which still suffers from the "Jarvisitis" of Proposition 13, but which has also seen higher tuition increases than the rest of the country.

A few years of flat state appropriations have been more than adequately compensated for through the increases in tuition and the institution of all manner of fees. Over the last decade, the Higher Education Price Index, which measures inflation in higher education, has run at more than twice the level of the Consumer Price Index, the standard measure of inflation. In many cases, there have been double digit increases in tuition and class sizes have grown along with reduced course offerings. Once instituted, tuition increases and fees are never rolled back. So the bizarre irony has developed that undergraduate students are forced to pay more and more for instruction that is being relentlessly degraded.

Where has all the money gone? The money diverted from the funding base of instruction has been almost entirely absorbed by bureaucratic bloat. A Michigan State Senate report on higher education concluded that there had been some very noticeable shifts in the expenditure patterns at Michigan's public universities. Between the years 1977 to 1989 there was a 33 per cent increase in administrative/professional employees, while there was a 5 per cent decrease in tenured faculty.

This surge in administrative/professional employees has seen a hike of more than 50 per cent over the same period in general administrative costs. Preliminary reports indicate that administrative expenses have risen at even higher rates in the years since.

A recent study of the University of California system shows that the ratio of spending on instruction to spending on administration dropped from $6-$1 in 1966 to $3-$1 in 1991, which the authors of the study refer to as "the existence of bureaucratic accretion," a technical term for bureaucratic bloat. This same study also concludes that over twenty-five years the number of administrative positions has increased at nearly twice the rate of teaching positions, at higher pay.

At Michigan State, which is representative of the country at large, administrators have been spending money like there's no tomorrow. The president's budget for "fundraising" and entertainment expenses has almost tripled over the last five years, as has his travel budget The current president is a former corporate banker. The provost's office soared through its budgetary ceiling five years running, even as budget cuts of 1-3 per cent were demanded from departments every year over this period. (The current provost stated in an interview that "once you get more than thirty students in a class, it doesn't matter if you have a thousand".)

At last count there were over one hundred deans at Michigan State, with similarly metastasizing support staff and expense accounts. In 1997, when the College of Social Science was demanding further cuts from departments, the dean added two new associate deans (again, with support staffs and expenses). Three years ago, when this dean's building reorganization plan ran short of cash, he diverted $100,000 from the Social Science teaching assistant budget (which has also been cut relentlessly) to complete his fine new offices. Departments no longer have support staff help for faculty, and the funding base of instruction continues to decline, yet the courts of the imperial commissars in administrative positions continue to demand greater amounts of higher education resources.

Part of the problem is that administrators are often tenured faculty themselves, and the maintenance of privileges for tenured faculty is in some ways based on the exploitation of lumpen academics, as scholars such as Cary Nelson and Richard Child Hill have pointed out. As noted by one Michigan State faculty member, "Who amongst my colleagues wouldn't trade an office in a stuffy, falling apart 100 year old building for a lush new office with a view of the Red Cedar River?"

As every generation of student radicals has discovered, high-minded talk about disinterested learning soon melts under the klieg lights of reality. In part because of the end of ideological competition with the Soviet Union, plus the unabashed, premillennial rhetoric of corporate triumph and dog-eat-doggery, the function of higher education in capitalist society is now finding its corresponding form without a tincture of shame. What these denizens of Grub Street-in-Academe need to find, like any reserve army of self-employed, is the proper organizations for self-defense and resistance. ■

CounterPunch
P.O. Box 18675
Washington, DC 20036

Presorted
First Class Mail
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 269
Skokie, IL

First Class Mail

Journalism for grown ups

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED